

**From:** Bill Richmond [Bll\_Rchmnd@yahoo.com]

**Sent:** Tuesday, December 05, 2006 8:27 AM

**To:** mlpacomments@resources.ca.gov; fgcc@fgc.ca.gov; Melissa Miller-Henson; refish@earthlink.net

**Subject:** MLPAComments: Stop global warming - Don't Adopt MLPA

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to ask you to think about what you are doing with the MLPA and not to vote for it.

The Governor has been on us in the auto industry to lower emissions and greenhouse gasses from cars. To lower the amount of fuel we consume and the amount of pollutants into the sky, we need to drive less often and go shorter distances.

With the MLPA, you are making us do just the opposite. It will have the effect of increasing pollution by shutting so many areas down. The increased air pollution will lead to increases in global warming. How can you vote for a plan that makes more emissions? You are making me, and every other fisherman, drive much much further on boats and in cars that pollute just to get to areas we still can fish. That is stupid when I can catch the same fish a lot closer. Is the MLPA more important to Californians than global warming? I don't think so and I doubt the governor thinks so either.

Did anyone analyze the environmental impact of this part of your MLPA process? Or the cost of extra fuel? I did not read anywhere in your papers that the MLPA looked at this and it a huge oversight in your analysis. I request that you provide a full accounting of additional gas that will be burned by closing 25 percent of the coast and what the governor thinks of that. The MLPA is only making people expend needless amounts of fossil fuels getting to further distances.

With gas prices as they are, the Department and Commission should be sincere to the goal of curbing emissions and stop the MLPA. Keep all the coast open to fishing. Thank you.

Bill Richmond  
Culver City